M

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,480	BOON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth Tang	2195	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeall claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS nerewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIP	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this app or other appropriate communication IGHTS. This application is subject to	olication. If not included will be mailed in due course	e. THIS ne initiative
1. $igtimes$ This communication is responsive to $\underline{\textit{the Amendment on 1}}$	<u>1/30/07</u> .		
2. X The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-6 and 10-23; now renumbere	ed as 1-20.		
 3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ur a) All b) Some* c) None of the: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * Certified copies not received: 	e been received. e been received in Application No		om the
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONN THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.	of this communication to file a reply MENT of this application.	complying with the requiren	nents
 A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subm INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which given 	nitted. Note the attached EXAMINER es reason(s) why the oath or declara	'S AMENDMENT or NOTIC ation is deficient.	E OF
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") mus	st be submitted.		
(a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers	son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	948) attached	
1) 🗌 hereto or 2) 🗍 to Paper No./Mail Date			
(b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner Paper No./Mail Date			
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the	i.84(c)) should be written on the drawithe header according to 37 CFR 1.121(ngs in the front (not the back d).) of
 DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT 	osit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL r FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGIC	must be submitted. Note t AL MATERIAL.	he
·			
Attachment(s)	E [Nation of Informal C	Potent Application	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Dotice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	 5. ☐ Notice of Informal F 6. ☒ Interview Summary 		
	Paper No./Mail Da	te <u>1/15/08</u> .	
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date	7. 🛭 Examiner's Amendi		
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	8. 🔀 Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance		
	9.	Lash	J,
		LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR. PRIMARY FXAMINER	-

10/722,480 Art Unit: 2195

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

- 1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
- 2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with John C. Gorecki on 1/15/08.
- 3. The application has been amended as follows:
 - a. In the Specification, page 15, line 12, insert after "software medium 84" -- , for example, a computer readable medium, --.
 - b. In the Claims:
 - i. In claim 1, line 1, replace "scheduling" with -- calculating --;
 - ii. In claim 14, line 2, replace "scheduling" with calculating --;
 - iii. In claim 15, line 3, replace "scheduling" with calculating --;
 - iv. In claim 23, line 5, replace "scheduling" with calculating --.

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are

10/722,480 Art Unit: 2195

canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

- 2. In the on 11/30/07, the claims were misnumbered after claim 19 (on page 6 of the Claim Amendment). Specifically, claim 21 followed claim 19, and claim 17 followed claim 21, which is incorrect.
- 3. Misnumbered claims 21 (page 7 of the 11/30/07 Claim Amendment) and 17 (page 7 of the 11/30/07 Claim Amendment) have been renumbered to claim 20 and claim 21, respectively.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-6 and 10-23 have now been allowed over the prior art of record.

The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance:

Per independent claims 1, 12, and 14: Independent claims 1, 12, and 14 include limitations relating to a method and computer readable medium containing a scheduler for execution and containing computer-executable instructions regarding the calculating central processing unit (CPU) usage by a given task with a top level class and sub-class, determining a target CPU usage for the given task from a weight associated with the sub-class representing a relative share of a target CPU usage associated with a parent class and a target CPU usage associated with the top level class, wherein the determination of the target CPU usage comprises forming a quotient by dividing the weight associated with the sub-class by a sum of weights associated with the plurality of sub-classes directly associated with the parent class, and multiplying the target CPU usage associated with the parent class by the quotient.

10/722,480 Art Unit: 2195

While these features are individually disclosed in the prior art, the prior art of record does not meet the conditions as suggested in MPEP section 2132, namely:

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an ipsissimis verbis test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)."

In particular, the prior art of record does not disclose features pertaining to the specific calculation of forming a quotient by dividing the weight associated with the sub-class by a sum of weights associated with the plurality of sub-classes directly associated with the parent class, and multiplying the target CPU usage associated with the parent class by the quotient (see independent claims 1, 12, and 14, Specification page 14, lines 19-28), in context of the claims.

The closest prior art uncovered during examination discloses the following elements:

- U.S. Patent 6,223,201 B1 issued to Reznek teaches a method of determining central processing unit (CPU) usage by a given task comprising determining a target CPU usage such as an allocated percentage of a processing time or a selected portion of processing time allocated (col. 5, lines 35-40, col. 2, lines 11-19).
- U.S. Patent 6,263,359 B1 issued to Fong et al. teaches a method of determining CPU usage by a given task (see Abstract, col. 1, lines 8-9 and 45-61) that associates said given task with a top level class and sub-class (job/task classes arranged in general hierarchy) (col. 2, lines 42-43, col. 14, lines 31-32, col. 3), wherein weights (weights or priority) are associated with said sub-class and a target CPU usage associated with said top level class

Application/Control Number:

10/722,480 Art Unit: 2195

(col. 12, lines 17-32, col. 14, lines 41-50, col. 2, lines 6-10 and 42-65, col. 10, lines 18-30).

3. While the prior art of record discloses determining of a target CPU usage (such as an allocated percentage of processing time or a selected portion of processing time allocated) with weights and a hierarchy of classes, none disclose the specific calculation involving forming a quotient by dividing the weight associated with the sub-class by a sum of weights associated with the plurality of sub-classes directly associated with the parent class, and multiplying the target CPU usage associated with the parent class by the quotient. This feature renders the claimed invention non-obvious over the prior art of record. Claims 2-6, 10-11, 13, 15-23 are allowable as being dependent from independent claims 1, 12, and 14 respectively.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt 1/14/08

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.